arXiv:1411.4381v2 [math.CV] 12 Jan 2015

ON ISOMETRIES OF CONFORMALLY INVARIANT METRICS

RIKU KLÉN, MATTI VUORINEN, AND XIAOHUI ZHANG

In Memoriam: J. Ferrand, 1918–2014

Abstract. We prove that isometries in a conformally invariant metric of a general domain are quasiconformal. In the particular case of the punctured space, we prove that isometries in this metric are Möbius, thus resolving a conjecture of Ferrand, Martin and Vuorinen [FMV, p. 200] in this particular case.

1. Introduction

The conformal invariant λ was introduced in [F1] in the general framework of non-compact Riemannian manifolds. In the elementary case of a domain D in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$, $n \geq 2$, we can define the function $\lambda_D(x, y)$ for $x, y \in D$, $x \neq y$, as the infimum of moduli of some curve families

$$\lambda_D(x, y) = \inf_{C_x, C_y} M(\Delta(C_x, C_y; D)),$$

where C_z is any curve in D joining a point $z \in D$ and the boundary of D. For the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$, the value of $\lambda_{\mathbb{B}^n}(x, y)$ can be explicitly expressed in terms of the hyperbolic distance $\rho(x, y)$ between x and y and the capacity τ_n of the Teichmüller condenser as follows [Vu, Thm 8.6]

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{B}^n}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}\tau_n\left(\sinh^2 \frac{\rho(x, y)}{2}\right). \tag{1.1}$$

It is easy to see that if H is a subdomain of D and $x, y \in H$, we have

$$\lambda_H(x, y) \leq \lambda_D(x, y).$$

As shown in [F2], for an arbitrary subdomain D of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathrm{Card}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D) \geq 2$, $\lambda_D(x, y)^{1/(1-n)}$ is always a metric. We say that a mapping $f : D \to f(D) \subset H$ is λ-Lipschitz if there exists a constant K such that

$$\lambda_D(x, y) \leq K\lambda_H(f(x), f(y))$$

for all $x, y \in D$. Because $(D, \lambda_D^{1/(1-n)})$ is a metric space, this terminology makes sense. Ferrand, Martin and Vuorinen [FMV] showed that λ-Lipschitz mappings contain quasiconformal mappings as a proper subclass. They proved, however, that many important properties of quasiconformal mappings, such as Hölder continuity in the Euclidean metric and the Schwarz-type lemma, also hold for these more general mappings. By the Riemann mapping theorem, it is easy to see from the

File: kvz20150109.tex, printed: 2015-1-13, 5.56

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30C65.

Key words and phrases. Conformal invariant, isometry, quasiconformal map, Möbius transformation.

The third author's research was supported by the Academy of Finland project 268009.

formula (1.1) that a λ-isometry is conformal for $n = 2$ when the domain is simply connected. For the case $n \geq 3$, isometries

$$f : (\mathbb{B}^n, \lambda_{\mathbb{B}^n}^{1/(1-n)}) \to (\mathbb{B}^n, \lambda_{\mathbb{B}^n}^{1/(1-n)})$$

are also conformal, in fact Möbius transformations. It was conjectured by Ferrand, Martin, and Vuorinen [FMV] that a λ-isometry is always conformal for general proper subdomains of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Unable to settle this conjecture, we will prove that λ-isometries are at least quasiconformal. We will also prove the conjecture in the special case of punctured space. Our results are as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let D and D' be two proper subdomains of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $f : D \to f(D) = D'$ be a homeomorphism which is an isometry of (D, λ_D) onto $(D, \lambda_{D'})$. Then f is quasiconformal with linear dilatation $H(f) \leq 256$.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be an isometry of $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}, \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}})$ onto $(f(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}), \lambda_{f(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\})})$. Then f is a Möbius transformation.*

2. Notation and preliminaries

We use the notation $\mathbb{B}^n(x, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - z| < r\}$ for the Euclidean ball, and its boundary is the sphere $S^{n-1}(x, r) = \partial\mathbb{B}^n(x, r)$. We abbreviate $\mathbb{B}^n(r) = \mathbb{B}^n(0, r)$, $\mathbb{B}^n = \mathbb{B}^n(1)$, $S^{n-1}(r) = S^{n-1}(0, r)$ and $S^{n-1} = S^{n-1}(1)$.

We next recall some basic facts from [Vu]. Let Γ be a curve family in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$, $n \geq 2$, and denote its modulus by $M(\Gamma)$. If $E, F, D \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$, then $\Delta(E, F; D)$ denotes the family of all curves joining E to F in D. Set $\Delta(E, F) = \Delta(E, F; D)$ if $D = \mathbb{R}^n$ or $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$. The capacities of the Grötzsch and Teichmüller condensers $\gamma_n(t), t > 1$, and $\tau_n(s), s > 0$, respectively, are defined by

$$\gamma_n(t) = M(\Delta(\overline{\mathbb{B}^n}, [te_1, \infty])),$$

and

$$\tau_n(s) = M(\Delta([-e_1, 0], [se_1, \infty])),$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. These strictly decreasing functions satisfy the basic identity [Vu, 5.53]

$$\gamma_n(t) = 2^{n-1}\tau_n(t^2 - 1), \ t > 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Next we define some related distortion functions. The function $\varphi_{K,n} : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$, $K > 0$, is the homeomorphism defined by $\varphi_{K,n}(0) = 0, \varphi_{K,n}(1) = 1$ and

$$\varphi_{K,n}(r) = \frac{1}{\gamma_n^{-1}(K\gamma_n(1/r))}, \quad r \in (0, 1). \tag{2.2}$$

Let

$$\psi_{K,n}(r) = \sqrt{1 - \varphi_{1/K,n}(\sqrt{1 - r^2}\,)^2}.$$

It follows easily from (2.1) and (2.2) that for $t > 0$,

$$\tau_n^{-1}(K\tau_n(t)) = \frac{1 - \varphi_{K,n}(1/\sqrt{1 + t}\,)^2}{\varphi_{K,n}(1/\sqrt{1 + t}\,)^2}. \tag{2.3}$$

For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0, e_1\}$, we denote

$$p(x) = \inf M(\Delta(E, F)),$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs of continua E and F with $0, e_1 \in E$ and $x, \infty \in F$. It follows from two spherical symmetrizations with centers 0 and e_1, respectively, that

$$p(x) \geq \tau_n(\min\{|x|, |x-e_1|\}). \tag{2.4}$$

For the punctured space $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, it is easy to check that for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,y) = \min\{p(r_x(y)), p(r_y(x))\}, \tag{2.5}$$

where r_z is a similarity map with $r_z(z) = e_1$ and $r_z(0) = 0$. The reader is referred to [AVV, Chapter 15] and [HV] for more details of the function p.

3. Proof of main theorems

Now we turn to the proof of main results.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a proper subdomain of $\mathbb{R}^n$, let $x \in G$, $d_G(x) = d(x, \partial G)$, $B_x = \mathbb{B}^n(x, d_G(x))$, let $y \in B_x$ with $y \neq x$, and let $r_G(x,y) = |x-y|/d_G(x)$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau_n\left(\frac{r_G(x,y)^2}{1-r_G(x,y)^2}\right) \leq \lambda_G(x,y) \leq \tau_n\left(\frac{r_G(x,y)}{2}\right).$$

Proof. The left-hand side of the inequality is well-known, see [AVV, 8.85 (2)(a)]. Next, we prove the right-hand side of the inequality. Let $z \in \partial G$ with $d_G(x) = |x-z|$. By the domain monotonicity, [AVV, 15.11], and conformal invariance of λ_G we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_G(x,y) &\leq \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{z\}}(x,y) = \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x-z, y-z)\\ &\leq \tau_n\left(\frac{|x-y|}{2\min\{|x-z|, |y-z|\}}\right)\\ &\leq \tau_n\left(\frac{r_G(x,y)}{2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

For convenient reference we record the following lemma from [AVV, 13.27].

Lemma 3.2. *For $n \geq 2$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $K \geq 1$, we have*

$$2^{1-2K} \leq \frac{\psi_{1/K,n}(r)}{r^K} \leq 1,$$

and

$$1 \leq \frac{\psi_{K,n}(r)}{r^{1/K}} \leq 2^{2-1/K}.$$

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** For given $x \in D$, let $0 < r < d_D(x)$ be sufficiently small such that $|f(x) - f(y)| < d_{D'}(f(x))$ whenever $|x-y| = r$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}|f(x)-f(y)| &\leq 2\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{D'}(f(x), f(y)))d_{D'}(f(x))\\ &= 2\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_D(x,y))d_{D'}(f(x))\\ &\leq 2\tau_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\tau_n\left(\frac{r_D(x,y)^2}{1-r_D(x,y)^2}\right)\right)d_{D'}(f(x)),\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$|f(x)-f(y)| \geq \sqrt{\frac{\tau_n^{-1}(2\lambda_{D'}(f(x),f(y)))}{1+\tau_n^{-1}(2\lambda_{D'}(f(x),f(y)))}}d_{D'}(f(x))$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{\tau_n^{-1}(2\lambda_D(x,y))}{1+\tau_n^{-1}(2\lambda_D(x,y))}}\, d_{D'}(f(x))$$
$$\geq \sqrt{\frac{\tau_n^{-1}(2\tau_n(r_D(x,y)/2))}{1+\tau_n^{-1}(2\tau_n(r_D(x,y)/2))}}\, d_{D'}(f(x)).$$

Using these inequalities we estimate the linear dilation of the λ-isometry.

$$\begin{aligned}
H(x,f) &= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} \frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{|f(x)-f(z)|}\\
&\leq \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} 2\tau_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\tau_n\left(\frac{r_D(x,y)^2}{1-r_D(x,y)^2}\right)\right) \Bigg/ \sqrt{\frac{\tau_n^{-1}(2\tau_n(r_D(x,z)/2))}{1+\tau_n^{-1}(2\tau_n(r_D(x,z)/2))}}\\
&= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} 2\tau_n^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\tau_n\left(\frac{r_D(x,y)^2}{1-r_D(x,y)^2}\right)\right) \Big/ \sqrt{\tau_n^{-1}(2\tau_n(r_D(x,z)/2))}\\
&= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} \frac{2\left(1-\varphi_{1/2,n}(\sqrt{1-r_D(x,y)^2})^2\right)/\varphi_{1/2,n}(\sqrt{1-r_D(x,y)^2})^2}{\sqrt{\left(1-\varphi_{2,n}(\sqrt{2/(r_D(x,z)+2)})^2\right)/\varphi_{2,n}(\sqrt{2/(r_D(x,z)+2)})^2}}\\
&= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} \frac{2\left(1-\varphi_{1/2,n}(\sqrt{1-r_D(x,y)^2})^2\right)}{\sqrt{1-\varphi_{2,n}(\sqrt{2/(r_D(x,z)+2)})^2}}\\
&= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} \frac{2\psi_{2,n}(r_D(x,y))^2}{\psi_{1/2,n}(\sqrt{r_D(x,z)/(r_D(x,z)+2)})}\\
&= \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0+}} 2\left(\frac{\psi_{2,n}(r_D(x,y))}{\sqrt{r_D(x,y)}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\psi_{1/2,n}(\sqrt{r_D(x,z)/(r_D(x,z)+2)})}{r_D(x,z)/(r_D(x,z)+2)}\right)^{-1}\\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \frac{r_D(x,y)}{r_D(x,z)/(r_D(x,z)+2)}\\
&\leq 2(2^{2-1/2})^2(2^{1-2\cdot 2})^{-1}2 = 256,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 3.2. This completes the proof. □

For the special case of the punctured space $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}$, we next give a better estimate for the linear dilatation.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a homeomorphism which is an isometry of $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}, \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{z_0\}})$ onto $(f(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\}), \lambda_{f(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{z_0\})})$. Then f is quasiconformal with dilatation $H(f) \leq 4$.*

Proof. Since a λ-isometry is quasiconformal by Theorem 1.2, the point z_0 is the isolated and removable singularity of f, and we can extend f to $\mathbb{R}^n$. It follows that $f(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{z_0\})$ is also a punctured space because $\mathbb{R}^n$ cannot be mapped quasiconformally onto a proper subdomain. By pre- and post-composition with Möbius maps we may assume that $z_0 = 0$ and $f(0) = 0$ since λ is conformally invariant. Hence f is a λ-isometry from $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. It is well known that [AVV, 15.13], for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \neq y$,

$$\tau_n\left(\frac{|x-y|}{m(x,y)}\right) \leq \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,y) \leq \tau_n\left(\frac{|x-y|}{2m(x,y)}\right), \quad m(x,y) = \min\{|x|,|y|\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then we have

$$\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,y))m(x,y) \le |x-y| \le 2\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,y))m(x,y),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{|f(x)-f(z)|} &\le \frac{2\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(f(x),f(y)))m(f(x),f(y))}{\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(f(x),f(z)))m(f(x),f(z))}\\ &= \frac{2\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,y))m(f(x),f(y))}{\tau_n^{-1}(\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(x,z))m(f(x),f(z))}\\ &\le \frac{2m(f(x),f(y))}{m(f(x),f(z))}\,\frac{|x-y|/m(x,y)}{|x-z|/(2m(x,z))}\\ &= \frac{4m(f(x),f(y))m(x,z)|x-y|}{m(f(x),f(z))m(x,y)|x-z|}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$H(x,f) = \limsup_{\substack{|x-y|=|x-z|=r\\ r\to 0}} \frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{|f(x)-f(z)|} \le 4. \qquad \square$$

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that $f:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism with $f(0)=0$ and f is a $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}$-isometry. Then f maps each ball centered at the origin onto a ball centered at the origin.*

Proof. The idea of this proof comes from [TV]. By precomposition with a stretching and a rotation we may assume that $f(e_1)=e_1$ and $\mathbb{B}^n\subset f(\mathbb{B}^n)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of all $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}$-isometries $f:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$ with the origin and e_1 fixed and $\mathbb{B}^n\subset f(\mathbb{B}^n)$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a normal family since by Lemma 3.4 all f are 4-quasiconformal with two common fixed points (see [V, Corollary 19.3 and Theorem 20.5]). Hence there exists a mapping $g\in\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$m_n(g(\mathbb{B}^n)) = \max\{m_n(f(\mathbb{B}^n)) : f\in\mathcal{F}\},$$

where m_n is the Lebesgue measure. If $m_n(g(\mathbb{B}^n)) > m_n(\mathbb{B}^n)$, then $\mathbb{B}^n\subsetneq g(\mathbb{B}^n)$, and therefore

$$g(\mathbb{B}^n)\subsetneq g\circ g(\mathbb{B}^n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad m_n(g\circ g(\mathbb{B}^n)) > m_n(g(\mathbb{B}^n)).$$

However, it is easy to see that $g\circ g\in\mathcal{F}$ which is a contradiction. Hence we have that $m_n(g(\mathbb{B}^n)) = m_n(\mathbb{B}^n)$, which implies $f(\mathbb{B}^n)=\mathbb{B}^n$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.7. *Let $S^{n-1}(r)$ be the sphere with center at the origin and radius $r>1$. Then for all $z\in S^{n-1}(r)\setminus\{re_1\}$,*

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(e_1,z) < \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(e_1,re_1).$$

Proof. It follows from (2.4) that for $r>1$,

$$p(\frac{1}{r}e_1) \ge \tau_n(1-1/r) > \tau_n(r-1) = p(re_1),$$

which together with (2.5) implies that

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(e_1,re_1) = \min\{p(re_1), p(\frac{1}{r}e_1)\} = p(re_1).$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(e_1,z) \le p(z) \le M(\Delta([0,e_1],[z,\infty])) < M(\Delta([0,e_1],[re_1,\infty])) = p(re_1),$$

where the strict inequality follows from the polarization, see [D, Theorem 1.1] and its statement about equality. Combining the above inequalities, we get the desired inequality. □



FIGURE 1. The map f is identical on $(0, \infty)$.



FIGURE 2. The map f is identical on the unit sphere.

3.8. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, by pre- and post-composition with Möbius transformations we may assume that f is an isometry of $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}})$ onto itself with the two points 0 and e_1 fixed.

By the estimate (3.5), we choose a constant $M > 0$ such that the metric ball $B_\lambda(e_1, M) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}(e_1, x) > M\}$ is simply connected and $B_\lambda(e_1, M) \subset H_+ = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) : x_1 > 0\}$. Set $u_0 = e_1$; for $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, set $u_{-(k+1)} = \partial B_\lambda(u_{-k}, M) \cap (0, u_{-k})$ and $u_{k+1} = \partial B_\lambda(u_k, M) \cap (u_k, \infty)$, see Figure 1. It is easy to see that

$$\bigcup_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} [u_k, u_{k+1}] = (0, \infty) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x = te_1, t > 0\}.$$

By Lemma 3.7, we see that $\partial B_\lambda(e_1, M) \cap S^{n-1}(|u_1|) = \{u_1\}$. Additionally, since the ball $B_\lambda(e_1, M)$ is symmetric with respect to the unit sphere, we also have that $\partial B_\lambda(e_1, M) \cap S^{n-1}(|u_{-1}|) = \{u_{-1}\}$. Since the mapping f is a λ-isometry and preserves the point e_1, it follows from Proposition 3.6 that f maps the point u_1 possibly to itself or to the point u_{-1}. By precomposition with the inversion with respect to the unit sphere, we may assume that $f(u_1) = u_1$. Hence, under this assumption we also get $f(u_{-1}) = u_{-1}$.

We are going to prove by induction that f is the identity map on the ray $(0, \infty)$. First, we prove that the restriction of f on the interval $[u_{-1}, u_1]$ is the identity map. The same argument as above applied to smaller metric balls $B_\lambda(e_1, K)$ with $K > M$ yields that for every $x \in (u_{-1}, u_1)$, the image of x under f is possibly itself or its symmetric point with respect to the unit sphere. The latter case actually

cannot happen since f is a homeomorphism of $[u_{-1}, u_1]$ with two endpoints fixed. Therefore, we see that f is the identity on the interval $[u_{-1}, u_1]$ as desired. Next, suppose that the restriction of f on the interval $[u_{k-1}, u_{k+1}]$ is the identity map for some integer k. Since $\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}}$ is invariant under stretching, by considering the metric balls $B_\lambda(u_{k-1}, K)$ and $B_\lambda(u_{k+1}, K)$ for $K \geq M$ we see that the same argument as in the interval $[u_{-1}, u_1]$ applied to the interval $[u_{k-2}, u_k]$ and to the interval $[u_k, u_{k+2}]$ yields that the restriction of f on the intervals $[u_{k-2}, u_k]$ and $[u_k, u_{k+2}]$ is the identity. Hence it follows from the induction that f is the identity map on the whole ray $(0, \infty)$.

Next we prove that after composing with some Möbius transformations, f is also the identity map on the unit sphere S^{n-1}. Since the metric ball $B_\lambda(e_1, M)$ is symmetric with respect to the unit sphere and also symmetric under the rotations in the ray $(0, \infty)$, considering the simply connectedness of $B_\lambda(e_1, M)$ we see that $\partial B_\lambda(e_1, M) \cap S^{n-1}$ is a circle centered at $(0, \infty)$ which is in the plane perpendicular to $(0, \infty)$. We denote this circle by $C(e_1, M) = \partial B_\lambda(e_1, M) \cap S^{n-1}$, see Figure 2. Choose arbitrarily a point $v \in C(e_1, M)$. We may assume that $f(v) = v$ by composition a rotation in the ray $(0, \infty)$ since $f(C(e_1, M)) = C(e_1, M)$. Let $C(v, M) = \partial B_\lambda(v, M) \cap S^{n-1}$ and $C(v, M) \cap C(e_1, M) = \{w_1, w_2\}$. Then $f(\{w_1, w_2\}) = \{w_1, w_2\}$ since we also have $f(C(v, M)) = C(v, M)$. We may assume that $f(w_1) = w_1$ after composing the reflection with respect to the plane determined by the rays $(0, \infty)$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x = tv, t > 0\}$. Under this assumption we also have $f(w_2) = w_2$. Similarly to the argument on the interval $[u_{-1}, u_1]$, considering smaller balls $B_\lambda(e_1, K)$ for $K \geq M$ we see that f is the identity map on the circular arc $\widehat{w_1 w_2} = C(v, M) \cap B_\lambda(e_1, M)$. The same argument yields that f is the identity map on the circular arcs $C(v, K) \cap B_\lambda(e_1, M)$ for all $K > M$, and hence on the area in the unit sphere enclosed by the two circles $C(v, M)$ and $C(e_1, M)$. Repeat above argument by considering the metric balls centered at e_1 and w_1, $B_\lambda(e_1, K)$ and $B_\lambda(w_1, K)$, for all $K \geq M$. Note that we already have $f(v) = v$. We obtain that f is also the identity map in the area in the unit sphere enclosed by the two circles $C(w_1, M)$ and $C(e_1, M)$. Applying the same argument by finite times, we see that f is the identity map on the whole unit sphere.

Now, for an arbitrary point $x \in S^{n-1}$, $f(x) = x$. Note that we already have that f is the identity map on $(0, \infty)$. The same argument as in the case of $(0, \infty)$ yields that f is the identity map on the ray through the point x emanating from the origin. Hence f is the identity map of the punctured space $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$.

References

[AVV] G.D. Anderson, M.K. Vamanamurthy, and M. Vuorinen: Conformal Invariants, Inequalities, and Quasiconformal Maps, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1997.

[D] V.N. Dubinin: Symmetrization in the geometric theory of functions of a complex variable, Russ. Math. Surv. 49 (1994), 1–79.

[F1] J. Lelong-Ferrand: Invariants conformes globaux sur les varietés riemanniennes, J. Differential Geom. Geom. 8 (1973), 487–510.

[F2] J. Ferrand: Conformal capacity and conformally invariant metrics, Pacific J. Math. 180 (1997), 41–49.

[FMV] J. Ferrand, G.J. Martin, and M. Vuorinen: Lipschitz conditions in conformally invariant metrics, J. Analyse Math. 56 (1991), 187–210.

[HV] V. Heikkala and M. Vuorinen: Teichmüller's extremal ring problem, Math. Z. 254 (2006), 509–529.

[TV] P. Tukia and J. Väisälä: A remark on 1-quasiconformal maps, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. 10 (1985), 561–562.

[V] J. Väisälä: Lectures on n-Dimensional Quasiconformal mappings, Lecture Notes in Math. 229, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1971.

[Vu] M. Vuorinen: Conformal Geometry and Quasiregular Mappings, Lecture Notes in Math. 1319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1988.

(Riku Klén) Department of Mathematics, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland
E-mail address: riku.klen@utu.fi

(Matti Vuorinen) Department of Mathematics, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland
E-mail address: vuorinen@utu.fi

(Xiaohui Zhang) Department of Physics and Mathematics, University of Eastern Finland, 80101 Joensuu, Finland
E-mail address: xiaohui.zhang@uef.fi